

---

**DRAFT**

COMMUNITY  
DEVELOPMENT

# M E M O

LONG RANGE PLANNING

---

**TO:** Plan Review Steering Committee  
**FROM:** Long Range Planning Staff  
**DATE:** April 6, 2000  
**SUBJECT:** Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of  
March 15, 2000

**Attendance:**

Steering Committee Members:

Jack Burkman	City of Vancouver Council Member
Jay Cervený	City of La Center Council Member
Jeanne Harris	City of Vancouver Council Member
Betty Sue Morris	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Craig Pridemore	Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)
Judie Stanton	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Jim Robertson	Mayor of Yacolt
Debi Smith	Town of Yacolt Council Member

Public:

Lynn Carman	Self
Susan Gilbert	Enterprise/Paradise Point Neighborhood Assn.
Ken Hadley	Self
Della (Kemp) Helmick	West Hazel Dell Neighborhood Assoc.
Debbie Larner	Self
Jim Malinowski	Clark County Citizens United
Pam Neal	Columbia River Economic Development Council
Scott Patterson	Clark County Association of Realtors
Laini Risto	WCV
Robert Schoenberg	Vancouver Business Journal
Bridget Schwarz	Fairgrounds Neighborhood Association
Read Stapleton	The JD White Company
Art Stubbs	NACCC/Green Meadows Neighborhood Assn.

Staff:

Monty Anderson	City of Washougal Planning Director
Mike Conway	City of Washougal Public Works Director
Bill Barron	Clark County Administrator
Rich Carson	Clark County Community Development Director
Evan Dust	Clark County Long Range Planning
Lianne Forney	Clark County Public Outreach & Information Director
Bob Higbie	Clark County Asst. Long Range Planning Manager
Eric Holmes	City of Battle Ground Planning Director
Patrick Lee	Clark County Long Range Planning Manager
Rich Lowry	Clark County Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Dale Miller	Clark County Long Range Planning
Troy Rayburn	Clark County Board of Commissioners' Office
Marty Snell	City of Camas Planning Director
Brian Snodgrass	City of Vancouver Planner
Deb Wallace	C-Tran

**Introductions / Roll Call**

Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations.

**February 16 Steering Committee Notes**

Motion to approve by Commissioner Stanton, second by Jack Burkman. Approved by voice vote.

**Review/Affirm Community Framework Plan**

Commissioner Pridemore led the Committee through a discussion of Chapters 1.0 through 7.0 of the Community Framework Plan. Mr. Lee began the discussion of each section by summarizing the section and highlighting certain policies. The discussion resulted in a list of issues to be revisited, as itemized at the end of this section.

It was pointed out that many of the policies have been implemented by code adoption, while others have not. Commissioner Morris suggested that perhaps the revised Comprehensive Plan could be annotated accordingly.

1.1 LAND USE Countywide Planning Policies

Discussion of Section 1.0 Land Use included changes proposed by TAC and county planning staff to the text of Policy 1.1 f., and accepted by the committee. The proposed new language was included in a copy of the "Framework Plan" that was handed out at the meeting. That additional text was proposed in response to the SB 6094 requirement to include specific language as countywide policy. It updates the review scope.

The first Buildable Lands Capacity Report to meet the new SB6094 requirements, as clarified by Mr. Lee, is due to be completed by September 1, 2002.

Mr. Lowry clarified that the desired new horizon year for the Comprehensive Plan is to the year 2022. The Committee agreed to December 31, 2021.

### 1.2 LAND USE Framework Plan Policies

Mr. Lowry pointed out that Policy 1.2.0 b. needs to be updated to reflect the Judge Poyfair decision regarding rural densities in rural centers.

Much of the discussion centered around the Urban Reserves policies. However, it was the consensus of the Committee to accept Section 1.2, with a change to Policy 1.2.0 b. as contemplated by Mr. Lowry.

### 2.0 HOUSING

Discussion centered around Policy 2.2.4 and the ability of small towns to achieve equitable distribution of affordable housing. The issue of "Housing" policy needs to be revisited in future sessions.

### 3.0 RESOURCE LANDS

Discussion of whether or not cities are stakeholders in resource lands, and the implications of urban adjacency to resource lands was inconclusive and needs additional discussion. Also, the question of whether or not Policy 3.2.7 regarding cluster developments has been fully implemented was asked. It was decided that staff would work with legal counsel on how to annotate the plan document. Further discussion of these issues is needed.

### 4.0 RURAL LANDS

Commissioner Pridemore pointed out that the large lot minimums referenced in Policy 4.2.3 are not defined.

Mr. Lowry indicated that Policy 4.2.4 has implications for UGA sizing.

Discussion revolved around the 80/20 policy which will be discussed later in the Comp. Plan update. The committee's consensus was that this section was still acceptable.

### 5.0 TRANSPORTATION

The policies in this chapter were characterized as upper level policies. Consensus was that this chapter is acceptable.

### 6.0 CAPITAL FACILITIES

Discussion revolved around impact fees and consistency of level-of-service across jurisdictions, with inconclusive results. There is a strong desire to engage the school districts earlier in the planning process. These issues need further discussion.

### 7.0 UTILITIES

Commissioner Morris questioned the language in Policy 7.1 b. Also, Policy 7.2.9 needs clarification.

Jeanne Harris suggested the Committee consider adopting water renewal/recycling policy. This issue needs further discussion.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Continue/Complete the Framework Plan discussion next session.
2. Steering Committee will consider further discussions on the following “framework plan” related issues:
  - Housing
  - Lands adjacent to resource lands
  - Impact fees\*
  - Level-of-service\*
  - Water re-use

\* Primarily related to transportation

### **Scope of Comprehensive Plan Review**

The draft document from the Board of County Commissioners outlining the scope of the Comprehensive Plan Review was distributed, and Commissioner Pridemore led the Committee through the outline. Commissioner Pridemore asked the Steering Committee if more frequent meetings would be acceptable to meet the two-year timeline. No specific response was given.

In the ensuing discussion, the issue was brought up of amendments needing to be made given the changes in outlook for mass transit. However, it was agreed that this needs to be a separate discussion issue outside the plan review.

### **Technical Advisory Committee Update**

#### Steering Committee Procedures

Bob Higbie outlined and summarized the document, *Procedures for Clark County Comprehensive Plan Review*, including the revised flow chart of relationships. Evan Dust discussed also clarified some of the procedures in the document.

Mr. Higbie pointed out that Sections 4.1.3 and 4.3 speak to the concerns of citizen input. Council Member Jack Burkman suggested that there be a public comment time at the end of each meeting.

The other issue of citizen input related to the jurisdictional boundaries for citizen representation, particularly in the Vancouver UGB. Councilor Burkman proposed that the a single citizen group represent the city and unincorporated area, as opposed to one in the unincorporated area and one inside city limits. Commissioners Pridemore and Morris disagreed indicating that this was unique to Vancouver since the other cities had much less unincorporated UBA land that was experiencing urban growth under county regulations. However, it was agreed that all of these issues need additional discussion in the next session.

## **Countywide Planning Policy**

The issue regarding the response to SB 6094 requirements was discussed above under Item #3 on the agenda, The Community Framework Plan.

## **Discussion of Operational issues**

The next Steering Committee meeting will be at 4:00 PM on Wednesday, April 19th in the Development Services Building, 1408 Franklin Street, Conference Room A/B. Staff was asked to pursue meeting locations with a capacity for at least 45 people.

## **Adjourned**

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 PM.

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - mar 15 2000 .doc

DRAFT